

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
SPECIES ASSESSMENT AND LISTING PRIORITY ASSIGNMENT FORM**

SCIENTIFIC NAME: Eremophila alpestris strigata

COMMON NAME: Streaked horned lark

LEAD REGION: Region 1

INFORMATION CURRENT AS OF: September 2005

**STATUS/ACTION**

☐ Species assessment - determined species did not meet the definition of endangered or threatened under the Act and, therefore, was not elevated to Candidate status

☐ New candidate

☒ Continuing candidate

☐ Non-petitioned

☒ Petitioned - Date petition received: December 11, 2002

☐ 90-day positive - FR date:

☐ 12-month warranted but precluded - FR date:

☐ Did the petition request a reclassification of a listed species?

**FOR PETITIONED CANDIDATE SPECIES**

a. Is listing warranted (if yes, see summary of threats below)? yes

b. To date, has publication of a proposal to list been precluded by other higher priority listing actions? yes

c. If the answer to a. and b. is "yes", provide an explanation of why the action is precluded. We find that the immediate issuance of a proposed rule and timely promulgation of a final rule for this species has been, for the preceding 12 months, and continues to be, precluded by higher priority listing actions (including candidate species with lower LPNs). During the past 12 months, almost our entire national listing budget has been consumed by work on various listing actions to comply with court orders and court-approved settlement agreements, meeting statutory deadlines for petition findings or listing determinations, emergency listing evaluations and determinations, and essential litigation-related, administrative, and program management tasks. We will continue to monitor the status of this species as new information becomes available. This review will determine if a change in status is warranted, including the need to make prompt use of emergency listing procedures. For information on listing actions taken over the past 12 months, see the discussion of "Progress on Revising the Lists," in the current CNOR which can be viewed on our Internet website (<http://endangered.fws.gov/>).

Yes Listing priority change

Former LP: 6

New LP: 3

Date when the species first became a Candidate (as currently defined): October 30, 2001

N/A Candidate removal: Former LP:

- \_\_\_ A – Taxon is more abundant or widespread than previously believed or not subject to the degree of threats sufficient to warrant issuance of a proposed listing or continuance of candidate status.
- \_\_\_ U – Taxon not subject to the degree of threats sufficient to warrant issuance of a proposed listing or continuance of candidate status due, in part or totally, to conservation efforts that remove or reduce the threats to the species.
- \_\_\_ F – Range is no longer a U.S. territory.
- \_\_\_ I – Insufficient information exists on biological vulnerability and threats to support listing.
- \_\_\_ M – Taxon mistakenly included in past notice of review.
- \_\_\_ N – Taxon does not meet the Act’s definition of “species.”
- \_\_\_ X – Taxon believed to be extirpated.

ANIMAL/PLANT GROUP AND FAMILY: Bird; Alaudidae

HISTORICAL STATES/TERRITORIES/COUNTRIES OF OCCURRENCE: Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia, Canada

CURRENT STATES/ COUNTIES/TERRITORIES/COUNTRIES OF OCCURRENCE  
Washington (Grays Harbor, Mason, Pacific, Pierce, Thurston, and Wahkiakum Counties), Oregon (Benton, Lane, Marion, and Polk Counties), and British Columbia, Canada (Vancouver Island)

#### LAND OWNERSHIP

In British Columbia, the last known breeding site was at Vancouver International Airport, and the most recent indication of breeding was from the Nanaimo Airport on southern Vancouver Island (COSEWIC 2003). A small amount of potential habitat occurs on private lands.

In Washington, one site is owned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), one site by the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), five sites by the U.S. Department of Defense, two sites by municipal airports, and two are privately owned.

In Oregon, streaked horned larks are found on Baskett Slough, Ankeny, and Finley National Wildlife Refuges, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers lands at Fern Ridge and two dredge spoil islands on the Columbia River and Willamette Mission State Park. These lands contain perhaps 20–25 percent of the Willamette Valley population (Bob Altman, American Bird Conservancy, pers. comm. 2000). The remainder of the population is on private lands.

LEAD REGION CONTACT: Paul Phifer (503-872-2823)

LEAD FIELD OFFICE CONTACT: Western Washington Fish and Wildlife Office, Kim Flotlin (360-753-5838)

#### BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION:

##### Species Description

Horned larks (*Eremophila alpestris*) are small, ground-dwelling birds, approximately 16–20 centimeters (6–8 inches) in length (Beason 1995). Adults are pale brown, but shades of brown vary geographically among the subspecies. The face has a yellow wash. Adults have a black bib, black whisker marks, and black “horns” – feather tufts that can be raised or lowered, but are usually raised in males. Black tail feathers have white margins. Juveniles lack the black face pattern and are varying shades of gray, from almost white to almost black with a silver-speckled back. The streaked horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris strigata*) has a dark brown dorsal surface, yellowish underparts, a walnut brown nape and yellow eyebrow stripe and throat (Beason 1995). This subspecies is conspicuously more yellow beneath and darker (reddish) on the back than any other subspecies of horned lark in the Pacific Northwest.

### Taxonomy

*Eremophila alpestris strigata* was first described by Henshaw in 1884; the type locality was Fort Steilacoom, Washington (Rogers 2000). This is one of 21 subspecies of horned larks in North America; 15 subspecies occur in western North America (Beason 1995). Subspecies of horned larks are based primarily on differences in color, body size, and wing size. Western populations of horned larks are paler and smaller than eastern and northern populations (Beason 1995). There are three other breeding subspecies of horned larks in Washington: *Eremophila alpestris alpina*, *Eremophila alpestris merrilli*, and *Eremophila alpestris lamprochroma* (Rogers 2000).

Drovetski et al. (2004) evaluated the conservation status and level of genetic diversity of the streaked horned lark using complete mitochondrial ND2 gene. Twenty samples from the southern Puget Sound region of Washington, and 60 horned lark samples from Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California were analyzed. Twenty-eight haplotypes identified among 80 horned larks formed three clades: Pacific Northwest (alpine and eastern Washington, Alaska), Pacific Coast (streaked horned lark (Puget Sound) and coastal California), and Great Basin (Oregon). Streaked horned larks were closely related to the California samples and only distantly related to the three closest localities (alpine and eastern Washington and Oregon). Only one of the eastern Washington individuals shared the streaked horned lark haplotype, indicating a gene flow from western Washington to eastern Washington. There was no evidence of immigration into the streaked horned lark population from any of the sampled localities. Statistically significant data analyses indicate the streaked horned lark population is well differentiated and isolated from all other sampled localities, including western California. All 20 streaked horned lark individuals shared the same haplotype with no variation in the ND2 sequences. All other localities had multiple haplotypes. A bottleneck caused by range contraction and habitat loss due to human activity probably caused such severe reduction of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) diversity. Streaked horned larks are unique, isolated, and have little genetic diversity, indicating the subspecies has been evolving independently for some time. Genetic analyses support the subspecies designation for the streaked horned lark (Drovetski et al. 2004), which has been considered a relatively well-defined subspecies based on physical characteristics (phenotypically) (American Ornithologists Union 1957; Behle 1942; Beason 1995). Consequently, the streaked horned lark is considered a conservation priority (Drovetski et al. 2004).

### Habitat

The streaked horned lark nests on the ground in sparsely vegetated sites in short-grass dominated habitats (Pearson 2003; Pearson and Hopey 2005). Historically this type of habitat was found in prairies in western Oregon and Washington and along the coast of Washington, and in prairies or prairie-like areas, estuaries, and sandy beaches in British Columbia. Today the streaked horned lark nests in native prairies, coastal dunes, fallow agricultural fields, lightly to moderately grazed pastures, seasonal mudflats, airports, and dredge spoil islands in the Columbia River (Gabrielson and Jewett 1940; Altman 1999; Rogers 1999a; Pearson 2003; Pearson and Hopey 2005; Pearson and Altman 2005).

#### Historical Range/Distribution

Historically, the streaked horned lark's breeding range extended from southern British Columbia (Campbell et al. 1997; COSEWIC 2003) south through the Puget lowlands and outer coast of Washington (Jewett et al. 1953). At the time of European settlement, the streaked horned lark was described as very abundant in all of the prairies of the Puget Sound region in Washington (Suckley and Cooper 1860; Dawson and Bowles 1909). The subspecies was considered common in the early 1950s on the prairies of western Washington and abundant throughout the valleys west of the Cascades in Washington (Jewett et al. 1953). There are historical breeding records for Whatcom, Skagit, Island, Pierce, Thurston, Mason, Grays Harbor, Pacific, and Clark Counties, Washington. Although there are no known breeding records, streaked horned larks may also have bred in King and Clallam Counties (Rogers 2000).

The breeding range extended farther south through the Willamette Valley of Oregon where the streaked horned lark was a year-round resident in the northern Willamette Valley (Johnson 1880). In the 1940s, the subspecies was a "very common permanent resident" in the southern Willamette Valley (Gullion 1950). Historically, the streaked horned lark was considered scarce along the Oregon coast (Gabrielson and Jewett 1940).

#### Current Range/Distribution

The streaked horned lark is currently considered rare and has been extirpated as a breeding species throughout much of its range, including the San Juan Islands and the northern Puget Sound region of Washington, and the Rogue Valley in Oregon (Altman 1999; Rogers 2000; Pearson 2003). It has always been rare in British Columbia and has declined steadily over the past 50 years. It is now essentially extirpated from Canada (COSEWIC 2003). The last known breeding record in British Columbia was in 1972 and the last summer sighting was in 1987. A few may have persisted in the Fraser Valley until the mid-1990s (Campbell et al. 1997). The most recent indication of breeding was from the Nanaimo Airport on southeastern Vancouver Island (COSEWIC 2003).

In Washington, the streaked horned lark is found in the Puget lowlands, coastal areas, and on Columbia River islands in Washington. Breeding sites are found in Grays Harbor, Mason, Pierce, Thurston, Pacific, and Wahkiakum Counties, Washington (Rogers 2000). Some streaked horned larks over-winter in Washington, but it appears that most over-winter in Oregon (Pearson and Altman 2005).

Streaked horned larks breed in the Willamette Valley in Oregon (Benton, Lane, Marion, and Polk Counties), and are most common in the central Willamette Valley, particularly in and around Baskett Slough National Wildlife Refuge. Breeding is not known in the Rogue and Umpqua Valleys in southwestern Oregon, and there is little information available on streaked horned larks breeding along the Oregon coast. Streaked horned larks over-winter in large groups in the Willamette Valley (Pearson and Altman 2005).

#### Population Estimates/Status

The Canadian population has declined nearly to extirpation, and is estimated to be between one and five birds (COSEWIC 2003) on southeastern Vancouver Island, near the Nanaimo Airport.

Approximately 380 streaked horned larks breed at 16 sites in Washington, including 6 in the Puget lowlands, 4 on the Washington coast, and 6 on Columbia River islands (Pearson and Altman 2005).

There are approximately 400 streaked horned larks at an unknown total number of sites in Oregon (Pearson and Altman 2005). Preliminary data indicates low nest success (Altman 1999).

Both the Washington and Oregon estimates are based on a significant amount of survey effort (Smith et al. 1997; Altman 1999, 2000; Rogers 1999a, 2000; MacLaren 2000; MacLaren and Cummins 2000; Pearson 2003; Pearson and Hopey 2005; Pearson and Altman 2005).

#### THREATS:

##### A. The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range.

The greatest threat to the streaked horned lark is loss of habitat. Primary factors contributing to the loss and degradation of habitat include the conversion of native grassland to other uses, such as agriculture, recreation areas, industry, and homes; encroachment of woody vegetation because of fire suppression; and invasion of prairie and coastal habitat by nonnative plant species, such as Scot's broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) and sod-forming grasses (*Holcus* spp. and *Arrhenatherum elatius*) (Hall 1995; Rogers 1999a).

Native prairies and grasslands have been virtually eliminated throughout the range of the species as a result of human activity. In the Willamette Valley in Oregon, native grassland has been reduced from the most common vegetation type to scattered parcels intermingled with rural residential development and farmland. It is estimated that less than 1 percent of the native grassland and savanna remains in Oregon (Altman 2000; Pearson and Altman 2005). In the south Puget Sound region, where most of Washington's prairies historically occurred, only 3 percent of the historic prairie is considered intact (Crawford and Hall 1997). In the remaining prairies, many of the native bunch grass communities have been lost to nonnative pasture grasses (Rogers 2000). The grassland at Cattle Point on San Juan Island has been invaded by nonnative sod-forming grasses that are avoided by streaked horned larks (S. Pearson, pers. comm. 2004).

In coastal areas, the introduction of Eurasian beach grass (*Ammophila arenaria*), currently found

in high densities on most of coastal Oregon and Washington, has drastically altered the structure of dunes on the outer coast. The tall, dense, leaf canopy of this plant creates unsuitable habitat for streaked horned larks (Rogers 1999b; MacLaren 2000). The vegetation density of this beach grass has increased in the fore and secondary dunes where streaked horned larks are likely to nest (Wiedemann 1987).

Streaked horned larks also use a variety of manmade habitats having sparse vegetation similar in structure to native prairies. However, these manmade habitats are subject to human disturbance (plowing, mowing, recreational and military activities), flooding (wetland mudflats), or are ephemeral in nature (plowed fields, bare ground in fields) (Altman 1999). Streaked horned lark populations are vulnerable to both direct threats (e.g., nest destruction) and indirect threats (e.g., nest abandonment due to disturbance and/or increased predation. Miller et al. (1998) documented the presence of a well-used nature trail in the vicinity of nesting grassland birds had a negative effect on bird productivity. In a study of four sites in 2002 and 2003, abandonment caused more than 20 percent of nest failures, and human activities caused 8 percent of nest failures (Stinson 2005). Consequently, populations using these areas may have low nesting success and these areas may actually be population sinks (Rogers 1999a).

The extent of changes in streaked horned lark populations along the Columbia River is unknown. One result of flood control by the construction of dams is the establishment of willows (Salix spp.), black cottonwood (Populus trichocarpa), and other vegetation on sandbars where this species may have nested (Rogers 2000).

Four streaked horned lark nesting sites in the south Puget Sound region are associated with airports, including two military bases (Rogers 2000; Pearson and Hopey 2005). Although regular grass mowing to meet flight path regulations may help maintain the grassland habitat, nests are occasionally destroyed by maintenance activities, especially when they are not adjusted in a way so as to avoid the nesting season (Pearson 2003; Pearson and Hopey 2005; Stinson 2005).

Airport expansions could result in further losses of some of these populations. Gray Army Airfield is planning on adding 130 more large helicopters to the airfield within the next year. These are a different type of aircraft than what is currently in use there. Use of these aircraft may have negative impacts to the species due to the high heat and wind velocity of rotor down wash, and a larger area set aside for aircraft storage (Pearson and Altman 2005; Stinson 2005). Also, the west ramp is being expanded, which will increase the amount of paved area (Stinson 2005).

Streaked horned lark nests on dredge spoil islands in the Columbia River are subject to destruction by dredging activities. Dredged material is deposited on spoil islands during the nesting season in habitat with documented use by streaked horned larks (Eric Cummins, WDFW, pers. comm. 2000). New dredge spoil was deposited at a location where streaked horned larks occurred in 1999 near Puget Island in the Columbia River. Although streaked horned larks were observed in the vicinity in 2000, only sparse low vegetation remained on the island. In a similar situation on the Oregon side of the Columbia River, eight singing males were observed on Rice Island in June 2000. Dredge spoil was deposited in July 2004, on Miller Sands Island where

singing males had been observed. In 2005, dredging equipment was staged on Miller Sands Island adjacent to nesting areas and two nests were abandoned (Pearson and Altman 2005). No streaked horned larks were observed all season on Sand Island, an island near the mouth of the Columbia River where dredge spoil is deposited (MacLaren 2000).

B. Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes.

None known.

C. Disease or predation.

Disease is not known to be a factor.

Predation is the primary source of nest failure (Pearson 2003; Pearson and Hopey 2005; Stinson 2005). Seventy percent of nest failures were caused by predation at four study sites in 2002. A garter snake (Thamnophis spp.) and American crow (Corvus brachyrhynchos) were observed eating young and eggs (Altman 1999; Pearson 2003; Pearson and Hopey 2005). Predation on grassland bird species by domestic cats and crows at one south Puget Sound site has been documented (Rogers 2000). Predation rates in the Puget lowlands and Columbia River/Washington coast lark sites are higher than rates reported for other grassland breeding birds (Pearson and Altman 2005).

Streaked horned larks apparently disappeared from the San Juan Islands in 1962 (Lewis and Sharpe 1987; Rogers 2000). Cattle Point, a former breeding site on San Juan Island, had not undergone a dramatic change in vegetation in 1962, although it has since been invaded by nonnative sod-forming grasses avoided by streaked horned larks (S. Pearson, pers. comm. 2004). Introduction of several exotic animal species to the island roughly coincides with the disappearance of the streaked horned lark. Introduced predators, including feral ferrets (Mustela outorius) and red foxes (Vulpes vulpes), may have significantly affected ground nesting birds and played a role in the decline of streaked horned larks (Rogers 2000).

D. The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms.

The streaked horned lark is protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) and by State laws as a nongame species. Breeding habitat, however, receives little protection from these laws. For example, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act prohibits the taking of “nests” but does not protect habitat.

The streaked horned lark is considered a Red List species in British Columbia, Canada, and is an endangered species there. However, it is essentially extirpated from Canada (COSEWIC 2003).

The streaked horned lark is listed as a State Candidate by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), but receives no protection under State law. Although there is no State Endangered Species Act in Washington, the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission has the authority to list species (RCW 77.12.020), and the WDFW has recently recommended that the streaked horned lark be listed as endangered in Washington. State listed species are protected

from direct take, but are not provided protection for their habitat (RCW 77.15.120). The streaked horned lark is a Priority Species under the WDFW Priority Habitats and Species Program. As a Priority Species, the streaked horned lark may receive some protection of its habitat under environmental reviews of applications for county or municipal development permits (Stinson 2005). Streaked horned larks are listed as critically imperiled (S1) by the Washington Natural Heritage Program.

Oregon has a State Endangered Species Act, but the streaked horned lark is not State listed. Although this species is on the Oregon sensitive species list and is considered critically sensitive, this designation provides little protection (ODFW 1996, OAR 635–100–0040). The “critical” designation indicates a species for which a listing as threatened or endangered is pending or listing as threatened or endangered may be appropriate if immediate conservation actions are not taken. Once an Oregon “native wildlife” species is federally listed as threatened or endangered, it is included as a State listed species and receives some protection and management, primarily on State owned or managed lands (OAR 635–100–0100 to OAR 635–100–0180; ORS 496.171 to ORS 496.192). The Oregon Natural Heritage Program lists the streaked horned lark as imperiled (S2).

E. Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence.

Streaked horned larks regularly collide with aircraft at the various airports on or adjacent to their nesting areas (McChord Air Force Base (AFB), Olympia airport). McChord AFB regularly flies falcons to scare birds off the airfield, and started using dogs for this purpose in 2005. The dogs cause larks to become alert and fly away (Pearson and Altman 2005). In June 2005, McChord AFB also hosted a military training event which included aircraft, vehicles, and tents parked or erected adjacent to and on top of lark nesting areas. And in August 2005, McChord AFB’s annual air show included simulated bombing and fire bombing of the area most heavily used by streaked horned larks; possibly affecting fledglings of late nests (Stinson 2005).

The small size of remaining individual nesting populations, combined with low genetic diversity, makes them vulnerable to local extirpation due to severe weather, predation, and human disturbance (e.g., mowing, trampling, etc.), which leads to nest destruction and/or nest abandonment. Analysis of mtDNA shows that streaked horned larks probably have suffered a loss of genetic diversity. Decreased genetic diversity causes an increased chance of inbreeding depression, reduced disease resistance, and reduced adaptability to environmental change, leading to reduced reproductive success.

The disappearance of streaked horned larks from San Juan Island, Washington, may also be related to the introduction of other exotic species, including the Eurasian rabbit (Oryctolagus cuniculus) and the Eurasian skylark (Alauda arvensis) (Rogers 2000). The grazing patterns of the Eurasian rabbit may have altered the vegetation structure preferred by streaked horned larks. Eurasian skylarks may have out-competed streaked horned larks for nest sites. Introduction of exotic species to the island roughly coincides with the disappearance of the streaked horned lark (Rogers 2000).

Along the coast of Washington, the amount of nesting habitat available is subject to the dynamic



process of erosion and accretion of sandy soils. When new land is created through accretion, there is a narrow window of time during which it is sparsely vegetated (and thus suitable for lark nesting), after which it becomes colonized by non-native beach grasses (and thus unsuitable for lark nesting). Changes in hydrology and currents can reduce the amount of sand export or affect the movement of sand along the coast (Pearson and Altman 2005).

In winter, streaked horned larks congregate in larger groups, and reside in fewer areas. Their wintering habitats mainly occur on privately-owned farmlands that are subject to unpredictable conversions to unsuitable foraging habitats. Also, when they are grouped together in larger numbers, they become even more susceptible to stochastic events that may occur in the winter (Pearson and Altman 2005).

Cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*) may pose a parasitism risk to eggs or nestlings, and/or they may lower streaked horned lark fledging success (Stinson 2005). Cowbirds have been observed on all streaked horned lark study areas. Although none of the studied nests have been found to contain cowbird eggs, fledgling cowbirds have been observed begging food from adult streaked horned larks. Horned larks in other states have suffered up to a 20 percent cowbird parasitism rate, with up to 63 percent of second clutches being parasitized (Stinson 2005).

#### CONSERVATION MEASURES PLANNED OR IMPLEMENTED:

##### Washington

The Service has funded surveys of breeding larks in Washington to better describe numbers and distribution of streaked horned larks. A streaked horned lark project, "Identifying Habitat Features and Developing a Survey Protocol for Breeding Streaked Horned Larks in the Puget Lowlands of Washington," was funded, in part, by the Service through a Cooperative Agreement with the WDNR in FY2002, FY2003, and FY2004. Objectives of the study included developing a streaked horned lark survey protocol and identifying habitat features important to successful breeding at the nest site, territory, and landscape scales. In 2002, 59 nests were located and monitored for reproductive success. Monitoring information gathered included arrival dates, clutch initiation dates, and dates of nesting activity. Habitat variables associated with 42 territories and 59 nests were measured at 4 Puget lowland sites. A GIS layer was created using location and behavior information for use by land managers in identifying streaked horned lark activity centers and adjusting management activities (e.g., mowing) in those areas. Three census methods were evaluated. Management recommendations included minimizing human activities in breeding areas, habitat restoration, Scot's broom control, control of sod-forming grasses, mowing timing and grass height, and eliminating potential sources of food (e.g., garbage and food scraps) for predators (Pearson 2003; Pearson and Hopey 2005).

Pearson and Hopey (2005) initiated an experimental study at Gray Army Airfield to examine the effects of a grass-specific herbicide that apparently kills nonnative pasture grasses but not native bunch grass (*Festuca roemerii*) or sedge (*Carex inops*). Application of the herbicide to areas with high coverage of nonnative grasses should result in a more sparsely vegetated habitat preferred by streaked horned larks. The first year of application (2003) was ineffective, likely due to bad timing of the application (Pearson and Hopey 2005). Lark response to the 2004 application was

scheduled to be measured in 2005 and reported in their 2006 report.

As a consequence of this project, local land/airport managers became concerned about the importance of the four breeding sites and, in consultation with the researchers, adjusted mowing activities to avoid streaked horned lark nests, restricted public access, restricted model airplane flying over streaked horned lark activity centers, and were interested in the potential effects of usual activities, including troop training on Fort Lewis, on streaked horned lark breeding. Gray Army Airfield modified mowing regimes to avoid disturbing or destroying nests. Fort Lewis did not renew a permit allowing a model airplane club's use of a streaked horned lark breeding area. Fort Lewis posted signs prohibiting all recreational activities near nesting streaked horned larks. From 2001 through 2004, Fort Lewis used nonbreeding season mowing and controlled burns to control Scot's broom (Pearson and Hopey 2005). September 2004 burns resulted in increased lark abundance and a dramatic vegetative response on 13<sup>th</sup> Division Prairie. Pearson and Hopey expected to measure vegetation and breeding bird response in 2005, and report their results in their 2006 report.

Fort Lewis has identified several grassland management goals for its ownership. These include no net reduction in the quantity or quality of moderate- and high-quality prairie; and, viable populations of all prairie-dependent and prairie-associated species (Altman 2003 as cited in Stinson 2005). Fort Lewis plans to stop and reverse the encroachment of Douglas-fir into grassland habitats on its base, control Scot's broom, restore the grassland/forest ecotone, maintain/augment habitat features for grassland-dependent species, restore damaged grassland, and inventory and monitor grassland habitats. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has been working with Fort Lewis on prairie habitat enhancement.

WDFW and WDNR, in cooperation with and with funding from the Service, have been conducting prairie restoration work in various Wildlife Areas and Natural Area Preserves in Washington.

The Washington Natural Heritage Program, WDNR, Service, University of Washington's Center for Urban Horticulture, and TNC have worked together on prairie plant propagation research (as cited in Stinson 2005). TNC has been testing and improving Scot's broom control techniques (Dunn 2003 as cited in Stinson 2005).

Fort Lewis, McChord AFB, WDFW, the Port of Olympia, and Pierce and Thurston Counties are developing a Candidate Conservation Agreement with the Service. One of their goals is to recover all federally listed and candidate species in the south Puget Sound Region. The Washington Natural Heritage Program is leading a group to develop a conservation plan for Boistfort Prairie in Lewis County.

WDFW has received funding and hopes to purchase 600 acres of the West Rocky Prairie, the largest and highest quality remaining south Puget Sound prairie on private lands. WDFW is also planning to purchase an 80-acre private inholding at the Black River-Mima Prairie Glacier Heritage Preserve. WDNR intends to expand the Mima Mounds Natural Area Preserve when they have available funding and willing sellers. TNC recently received a conservation easement donation on 613 acres of the Cavness ranch on Frost Prairie south of Tenino.

SUMMARY OF THREATS (including reasons for addition or removal from candidacy, if appropriate):

The following information is based on information contained in our files. No new information was provided in the petition received December 11, 2002. The streaked horned lark occurs in British Columbia, Canada, Washington, and Oregon. The streaked horned lark nests on the ground in sparsely vegetated sites in short-grass dominated habitats, such as native prairies, coastal dunes, fallow agricultural fields, lightly to moderately grazed pastures, seasonal mudflats, airports, and dredged-material formed islands in the Columbia River. It is essentially extirpated from Canada. In Washington, surveys show that there are approximately 380 remaining breeding birds (Pearson and Altman 2005). In Oregon, the breeding population is estimated to be approximately 400 birds.

The streaked horned lark's breeding habitat is threatened by loss and degradation due to conversion of native grasslands to other uses (such as agriculture, homes, recreational areas, and industry), encroachment of woody vegetation, and invasion of nonnative plant species (e.g., Scot's broom and sod-forming grasses). Native prairies have been nearly eliminated throughout the range of the species. It is estimated that less than 1 to 3 percent of the native grassland and savanna remains. Those that remain have been invaded by nonnative sod-forming grasses. Coastal nesting areas have suffered the same fate. Wintering habitats are seemingly few, and susceptible to unpredictable conversion to unsuitable over-wintering habitat. Where larks inhabit manmade habitats similar in structure to native prairies (such as airports, military reservations, agricultural fields, and dredge formed islands), they are subjected to a variety of unintentional human disturbances such as mowing, recreational and military activities, plowing, flooding, and dredge spoil dumping during the nesting season, as well as intentional disturbances such as at the McChord AFB where falcons and dogs are used to haze the birds in order to avoid aircraft collisions. In some areas, landowners have taken steps to improve streaked horned lark nesting habitat.

The magnitude of threat is considered high due to small populations with low genetic diversity, and patchy and isolated habitats in areas desirable for development. The threat of invasive plant species is high and constant. The numbers of individuals are low and the numbers of populations are few. Over-wintering birds are concentrated in larger flocks and subject to unpredictable wintering habitat loss, potentially affecting a large portion of the population at one time. In Washington, known populations occur on airports and two military bases where management and training activities can negatively impact streaked horned lark breeding. In British Columbia, the one potentially remaining site with breeding birds occurs at an airport. The immediacy of threat is considered to be imminent, due to the continued loss of suitable lark habitat, risks to the wintering populations, plans for development on and adjacent to two of its nesting areas, use of falcons and dogs to haze breeding birds at McChord AFB, planned expansions of the McChord AFB west ramp and Olympia airport, the planned addition of 130 more helicopters at the Gray Army Airfield, and annual Air Force military training and fire bombing on top of lark nesting habitat. Because of the increased imminence of threats we changed the listing priority number for the streaked horned lark from 6 to 3.

## RECOMMENDED CONSERVATION MEASURES:

- Identify primary nest predators
- Identify habitat features associated with successful nesting
- Cover garbage cans and pick up food scraps near streaked horned lark breeding locations to reduce predator food sources.
- Mowing, dredge spoils deposition, vehicle traffic, model airplane flying, bird watching, kite flying, fireworks, dog walking, and gatherings of people and vehicles appear to negatively affect the breeding success of streaked horned larks. The timing and/or locations of these activities should be scheduled so as to avoid lark nesting areas, especially during the nesting season (mid-April to early August) (Pearson and Hopey 2005). Limit most human activities within 30 meters of breeding larks.
- Conduct controlled burns in known breeding areas after mid-August and before March. This should not occur in high-quality native prairies, or where/when other rare prairie-dependent species may be negatively affected.
- Create and maintain high-quality prairie habitat, away from suburban and forested edges. In the Puget Sound lowlands, focus on large, open grasslands (100s of acres in size).
- In airport areas, mow streaked horned lark nesting areas very low before and/or after the breeding season.
- Restoration activities should be treated as experiments so that the effectiveness of treatments can be assessed.
- Do not deposit dredge spoils on active breeding areas during the breeding season.
- Encourage farming practices that create and maintain bare ground within grass and forb dominated fields in Oregon.
- Along the coast, use volunteers to encourage people to avoid lark nesting areas and to educate them about the lark's vulnerability to human activities. Limit beach access in lark nesting areas.
- Increase the amount and extent of lark wintering habitat to reduce the potential for large population losses due to sudden changes in habitat or severe weather.
- Identify nesting sites that can be restored and then protect them.
- Determine the feasibility of reintroducing larks to protected areas.
- Conduct research such as discussed in Pearson and Altman (2005), which would increase our understanding of lark habitat selection, location, amount, and use, and those factors which affect survival of larks in their nesting and wintering habitats.

LISTING PRIORITY:

THREAT			
Magnitude	Immediacy	Taxonomy	Priority
<b>High</b>	<b>Imminent</b>	Monotypic genus	1
		Species	2
		<b>Subspecies/population</b>	<b>3</b>
	Non-imminent	Monotypic genus	4
		Species	5
		Subspecies/population	6
Moderate to Low	Imminent	Monotypic genus	7
		Species	8
		Subspecies/population	9
	Non-imminent	Monotypic genus	10
		Species	11
		Subspecies/population	12

**Rationale for listing priority number:**

*Magnitude:* The high magnitude of threat is due to small populations with patchy and isolated distributions in habitats highly desirable for development. The threat of invasive plant species to the quality of a highly specific habitat requirement is high and constant. The numbers of individuals are low and the numbers of populations are few. In Washington, known populations occur on airports and two military bases where routine management and training activities have impacted streaked horned lark breeding.

*Imminence:* Specific threats are known to be immediate in nature. Even though some conservation measures have been initiated by some of the land managers, these measures are not outweighed by the continuing threats to the small number of birds that remain. This is particularly true on the species' wintering grounds, private lands in Oregon where nesting occurs, and airports in Washington where various expansion projects are planned or being implemented on or adjacent to lark nesting habitats.

Yes Have you promptly reviewed all of the information received regarding the species for the purpose of determining whether emergency listing is needed?

Is Emergency Listing Warranted? No Although there are few populations, they are widely scattered such that there is no single threat likely to result in extirpation simultaneously. Conservation measures for the listed snowy plover may benefit coastal populations of streaked horned larks. It is hoped that ongoing Candidate Conservation Agreement negotiations with some of the major nesting area landowners in Washington will result in significant benefits to the species, but based on activities occurring at one of these areas in 2005, the end results remain to be seen.

## DESCRIPTION OF MONITORING:

The Service has funded, in part, much of the recent survey, research, and monitoring efforts for the streaked horned lark. We maintain contact with the responsible agencies and species experts and annually request their reviews and updates to the candidate assessment forms during the revision process. Relevant literature and data for this species are obtained principally from contacts with responsible agencies and experts and their reports. Periodic literature searches for this species are also completed.

Management activities implemented in relation to the study of the four Puget Sound area streaked horned lark populations will be monitored.

Monitoring and research to obtain information on populations, habitat variables, and features associated with streaked horned lark populations along the Washington coast and on islands in the Columbia River are scheduled for 2006.

## COORDINATION WITH STATES

Indicate which State(s) (within the range of the species) provided information or comments on the species or latest species assessment: Washington, Oregon

Indicate which State(s) did not provide any information or comments: N/A

## LITERATURE CITED:

- Altman, B. 1999. Status and conservation of state sensitive grassland bird species in the Willamette Valley. Report to Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Corvallis, Oregon.
- Altman, B. 2000. Conservation strategy for landbirds in lowlands and valleys of western Oregon and Washington. Version 1.0. American Bird Conservancy. Boring, Oregon.
- American Ornithologists' Union. 1957. Check-list of North American birds. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.
- Beason, R.C. Horned lark (Eremophila alpestris). No. 195 in The birds of North America (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The American Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.
- Behle, W.H. 1942. Distribution and variation of the horned larks (Otocoris alpestris) of western North America. Univ. of Calif. Publ. in Zool. 46:205–316.
- Bowles, J.H. 1898. Notes on the streaked horned lark. Osprey 3:53–54.
- Bowles J.H. 1900. Nesting of the streaked horned lark. Condor 2:30–31.
- Campbell, W.R., N.K. Dawe, I. McTaggart-Cowan, J.M. Copper, G.W. Kaiser, M.C.E. McNall, and G.E.J. Smith. 1997. The birds of British Columbia. Vol. 3. Passerines, flycatchers through vireos. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.
- Center for Biological Diversity, Friends of the San Juans, Oregon Natural Resources Council, and Northwest Ecosystem Alliance. 2002. Petition to list streaked horned lark (Eremophila alpestris strigata) as a federally endangered species.
- COSEWIC. 2003. COSEWIC assessment and update status report on the horned lark strigata subspecies Eremophila alpestris strigata in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa. vi + 23 pp. ([www.sararegistry.gc.ca/status/status\\_ec.cfm](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/status/status_ec.cfm))
- Crawford, R. and H. Hall. 1997. Changes in the south Puget prairie landscape. pp. 11–16 in P. Dunn and K. Ewing, eds. Ecology and conservation of the South Puget Sound prairie landscape. The Nature Conservancy, Seattle, Washington.
- Dawson, L.W. and J.H. Bowles. 1909. The birds of Washington. Occidental Press, Seattle, Washington.
- Drovetski, S.V., S.F. Pearson, and S. Rohwer. 2004. Implications of mitochondrial DNA diversity on the conservation status of the streaked horned lark Eremophila alpestris strigata. Draft unpublished manuscript. 18 pp.

- Dubois, A.D. 1935. Nests of horned larks and longspurs on a Montana prairie. *Condor* 37:56–72.
- Gabrielson, I.N. and S.G. Jewett. 1940. The birds of Oregon. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis.
- Gilligan, J., D. Rogers, M. Smith, and A. Contreras. 1994. Birds of Oregon. Cinclus Press, McMinnville, Oregon.
- Hartman, C.A., and L.W. Oring. 2003. Orientation and microclimate of horned lark nests: the importance of shade. *Condor* 105:158–163.
- Henshaw, H.W. 1884. The shore larks of the United States and adjacent territory. *Auk* 1:254–268.
- Jewett, S.G., W.P. Taylor, W.T. Shaw, and J. Aldrich. 1953. Birds of Washington State. U. of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Lack, D. 1954. The natural regulation of animal numbers. Oxford University Press, London.
- MacLaren, P.A. 2000. Streaked horned lark surveys in western Washington, year 2000. Unpub. report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lacey, WA. 12 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and E.B. Cummins. 2000. Streaked horned lark surveys in western Washington. Unpublished report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Miller, S.G., R.L. Knight, and C.K. Miller. 1998. Influence of recreational trails on breeding bird communities. *Ecological Applications* 8: 162–169.
- Pearson, S. 2003. Breeding phenology, nesting success, habitat selection, and census methods for the streaked horned lark in the Puget lowlands of Washington. Natural Areas Report 2003–2. Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia. 38 pp.
- Pearson, S. and B. Altman. 2005. Range-wide streaked horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris strigata*) assessment and preliminary conservation strategy. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA. 25 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. Hopey. 2004. Streaked horned lark inventory, nesting success and habitat selection in the Puget lowlands of Washington. Natural Areas Report 2004–1. Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia. 36 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and M. Hopey. 2005. Streaked horned lark nest success, habitat selection, and habitat enhancement experiments for the Puget lowlands, coastal Washington, and Columbia River Islands. Natural Areas Report 2005–01. Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia. 49 pp.



- Promislow, D.E.L., R. Montgomerie, and T.E. Martin. 1992. Mortality costs of sexual dimorphism in birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*.
- Rogers, R. 1999a. The streaked horned lark in western Washington. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Western Washington Office. 14 pp.
- Rogers, R. 1999b. Natural History: Streaked Horned lark and land management. *Environmental Practice* 1:77-78.
- Rogers, R. 2000. The status and microhabitat selection of streaked horned lark, western bluebird, Oregon vesper sparrow and western meadowlark in western Washington. M.S. Thesis, Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington. 185 pp.
- Smith, M., P.W. Mattocks, Jr., and K.M. Cassidy. 1997. Breeding birds of Washington State. Vol. 4 in K.M. Cassidy, C.E. Crue, M.R. Smith, and K.M. Dvornich, eds. Washington State Gap Analysis – Final Report, Seattle Audubon Society Publications in Zoology No. 1, Seattle, Washington.
- Suckley, G., and J.G. Cooper. 1860. The natural history of Washington Territory. Baillire Brothers, New York, New York.
- Stinson D.W. 2005. Washington State Status Report for the Mazama Pocket Gopher, Streaked Horned Lark, and Taylor's checkerspot. WDFW, Wildlife Program. 140 pp.
- Wiedemann, A.M. 1987. The ecology of European beachgrass (Ammophila arenaria (L.) Link): a review of the literature. Unpublished report to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Technical Report 87-1-01.

APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE: Lead Regions must obtain written concurrence from all other Regions within the range of the species before recommending changes, including elevations or removals from candidate status and listing priority changes; the Regional Director must approve all such recommendations. The Director must concur on all resubmitted 12-month petition findings, additions or removal of species from candidate status, and listing priority changes.

Approve: **Acting** David Wesley 11/10/05  
Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service Date

Marshall P. Jones

Concur: \_\_\_\_\_ August 23, 2006  
Director, Fish and Wildlife Service Date

Do not concur: \_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Fish and Wildlife Service Date

Date of annual review:  
Conducted by: